

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed February 14, 2006, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1-16, 18-24, and 78-86 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-16, 18-24, and 78-81 are allowed. Claims 82 and 86 stand rejected. Claims 83-85 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but the indication of allowable subject matter in such claims is noted with appreciation. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application herein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 82 and 86 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

“The test for definiteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is whether ‘those skilled in the art would understand what is claimed when the claim is read in light of the specification.’” *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 806 F.2d 1565, 1576 1 USPQ2d 1081, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 1986); M.P.E.P. § 2173.02.

Claim 82 recites, in part, a method for singulating a semiconductor die from a semiconductor wafer that includes cutting a plurality of trenches across the wafer at substantially the same time, or concurrently, with a plurality of laser beams. The wafer or the plurality of lasers is rotated perpendicularly to the direction of mutual travel and a second plurality of trenches is cut.

One skilled in the art would understand what is claimed in independent claim 82 when the claim is read in light of the specification and the drawing. *See, e.g.*, ¶¶ [0042-45]; FIG. 7. Therefore, because claim 82 satisfies the standard for definiteness that the Federal Circuit set forth in *Orthokinetics, Inc.*, the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 82 is respectfully requested.

The withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 83-85 is respectfully requested as each depends either directly or indirectly from allowable independent claim 82, among other reasons.

Claim 86 recites, in part, a method for singulating a semiconductor die from a semiconductor wafer that includes cutting through the semiconductor wafer body with a plurality of lasers disposed in a row that is perpendicular to the direction of mutual travel between the wafer and the row of lasers. The lasers cut through a trench formed in the wafer in a single pass. The wafer or the plurality of lasers is rotated perpendicularly to the direction of mutual travel and additional cuts are made along some of the plurality of streets by the lasers.

One skilled in the art would understand what is claimed in independent claim 86 when the claim is read in light of the specification and the drawing. *See, e.g.*, ¶¶ [0042-45]; FIG. 7. Therefore, because claim 86 satisfies the standard for definiteness that the Federal Circuit set forth in *Orthokinetics, Inc.*, the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 86 is respectfully requested.

Objections to Claims 83 through 85/Allowable Subject Matter


Claims 83 through 85 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The indication that claims 83-85 recite allowable subject matter is appreciably noted, but because each depends either directly or indirectly from allowable independent claim 82 no amendments have been made to the claims.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-16, 18-24, and 78-86 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Serial No. 10/797,504

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Craig Buschmann', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Craig Buschmann
Registration No. 57,829
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: April 13, 2006
CB/sfc:eg
Document in ProLaw